DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 603 24 CG 007 598

AUTHOR	Peevers, Barbara H.; And Others
TITLE	Personal Causation and Children's Concepts of Persons. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Nevada Univ., Reno.
BUREAU NO	BR-0-I-028
PUB DATE	Mar 72
GRANT	OEG-9-70-0053(057)
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Science Research; *Childhood Attitudes; Cognitive Processes; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Interviews; Peer Relationship; Perception; *Questioning Techniques; *Questionnaires; Research Tools

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to explore the development of, and relationships among, individual modes of (1) articulating knowledge about and evaluation of peers; (2) attributing causality for interpersonal events to the self and to others; (3) attributing one's own and other's behavior to intentionality or accident. Data was collected for this purpose using a free response interview in which friends and a disliked peer were described by 80 children and young people as the measure of modes of perceiving persons. The Personal Causality Questionnaire (PCQ) consists of 35 questions about everyday interpersonal situations to which participants respond in their own words. The PCQ was found to be a tool which can be used to investigate the relationships among attribution of causality and intentionality, and various modes of describing persons. It was concluded that personal causality and self initiation, as assessed by the PCQ, have a number of important applications to education. (Author/BW)

ED 067603

P-I-028
Pg 01

Final Report

Grant No. OEG-9-70-0053 (057)

PERSONAL CAUSATION AND CHILDREN'S CONCEPTS OF PERSONS

Barbara Hollands Peevers, James J. Blascovich and Paul F. Secord
Department of Psychology
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada 89507

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

March 1972

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CG 007 528

Final Report

Grant No. OEG-9-70-0053 (057)

PERSONAL CAUSATION AND CHILDREN'S CONCEPTS OF PERSONS

Barbara Hollands Peevers, James J. Blascovich and Paul F. Secord

University of Nevada, Reno

Reno, Nevada

March 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Contents

Introduction 1

Methods and Results. 3

Conclusion 7

References 10

Appendix A 12

Appendix B 17

Appendix C 23

Summary

The original purpose of this research was to explore the development of and the relationships among individual modes of (1) articulating knowledge about and evaluation of peers; (2) attributing causality for interpersonal events to the self and to others; and (3) attributing one's own and others' behavior to intentionality or accident.

Data was collected for this purpose using a free response interview in which friends and a disliked peer were described by 80 children and young people as the measure of modes of perceiving persons. The Children's Picture Test of Internal-External Control (Battle and Rotter, 1963) was administered to participants as the measure of attribution of causality. This instrument has been used by other researchers, and was considered to be adequate for the purpose of this research. However, because of conceptual problems with scoring and low test-retest reliability it was decided that the Picture Test was not measuring the variable conceptualized for this project.

Consequently, all subsequent efforts were directed at devising an instrument which would measure not only the attribution of causality in interpersonal situations, but also the attribution of intentionality to the self and to others.

The Personal Causality Questionnaire (PCQ) consists of 35 questions about everyday interpersonal situations to which participants respond in their own words. A system for content analyzing responses has been developed which has high inter-coder reliability (.91 to .96). Responses are classified as implying that causality lies in the individual himself (personal locus of causality) or in the other person (external locus). In addition, responses are classified according to the degree of agent-initiation implied: strong initiation is implied by statements which indicate the action was initiated by intention or purpose; moderate initiation is implied when reference is made to the personal characteristics of the initiator; and low initiation is implied by references to circumstance. The individual is categorized with regard to locus of causality as personal or external and assigned a corresponding score indicating the degree of initiation he perceives. Test-retest coefficients range from .75 to .82. Preliminary work indicates a relationship between scores on the PCQ and insightfulness of person descriptions.

Introduction

The theory that attribution of causality and intentionality to a person provides the foundation for the attribution of enduring personal characteristics to that person is increasingly held by researchers and theorists in the area of person perception. It has also become clear that the process of person perception, i.e., knowing and evaluating other persons, can be fully understood only by focusing on individual differences in the ways persons conceptualize others. The original purpose of this research was to examine the development of and the relationships among the attribution of causality, intentionality, and individual modes of describing persons. Clarification of such relationships would provide insight into the general process of knowing and evaluating others, which is one key to understanding the individual and his behavior. For example, a child's behavior toward teachers and peers is partly a function of how he perceives these persons, and this in turn depends upon his level of development of the concepts of causality, intentionality, and person dimensions.

A brief review of the literature relevant to the concepts of causality and intentionality follows.

Heider (1944, 1958) theorized that the process of knowing others is one of attribution of causality and intentionality. He made the general point that a person ascribes a change in his world to an origin, and that this origin may be the person himself, the environment (including luck), or another person. Causality ascribed to other persons provides the raw material from which social perception is shaped. In Heider's analysis action effects can be viewed as intentional, incidental, or accidental. It is effects perceived as intentional which form the basis for the attribution of dispositions to an individual.

DeCharms (1968) argued in the same tradition that knowledge of others stems from personal knowledge; that is, knowledge of one's own powers of causality and one's own desires and intentions. He has described an origin-pawn notion. The tendency of an individual to view actions as internally or externally caused is a disposition, or personality characteristic. A person who thinks of himself as an origin has a strong feeling of personal causation; he believes that the locus of causality for most effects in his environment lies within himself. A person who thinks of himself as a pawn, on the other hand, feels causal forces to be beyond his control, residing in other people or in the physical environment.

The concept of internal vs. external control of reinforcement (Rotter, Seeman, and Liverant, 1962) is somewhat similar to the origin-pawn concept. Like the latter, it is also thought of as dispositional, varying from one individual to another. Persons who view actions as internally controlled attribute the reinforcements they receive to their own behavior, and believe in their own potential to change their environment. Individuals who emphasize external control, on the other

hand, attribute their reinforcements to other people or to luck. Since they believe their reinforcements to be out of their control, they are generally passive in their attempts to change their world.

A number of scales have been developed to measure an individual's internal-external orientation toward causality. The Internal-External Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) has been used the most extensively. Scales for children include the Children's Locus of Control Scale (Bialer, 1961), the Children's Picture Test of Internal-External Control (Battle and Rotter, 1963), and the Locus of Control Scale for Children (Nowicki and Strickland, 1970). The Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Scale (Crandall, Katkovsky and Preston, 1962) measures acceptance of responsibility in the academic area, a concept closely related to attribution of causality.

Although little empirical work has been done with regard to the concept of intentionality and its relation to attribution of personal characteristics, it has attracted considerable theoretical attention. Jones and Davis (1965) analyzed the concept of intentionality in relation to the attribution of personal characteristics, and presented a "theory of correspondent inferences." Intentions are inferred from actions, and dispositions from intentions. Correspondence refers to the extent that the action and the ascribed disposition are believed to belong together; that is, the confidence with which the disposition is attributed. They suggested several factors that affect the degree of correspondence, which include "non-common effects," "assumed desirability of effects," "hedonic relevance," and "personalism." Implicit in their reasoning is that one must understand himself, so that when he views another's action he knows what he himself would have intended had he performed that action. In this way he attributes intention, and consequently dispositions, to others. Kelley (1967) reviewed Jones and Davis' theory and made the additional suggestion that consistency over time must be included among factors contributing to correspondence. He suggested that the study of the development of the attribution process, with respect to maturation, socialization and language training would be valuable.

In summary, the concept of internal vs. external causality has received considerable research attention, both as a general orientation, and with regard to a specific content area. The concept of attribution of intentionality has been theoretically formulated as an essential link to knowledge of other people, but has not been investigated widely in this context.

The plan for this research project was to interview 80 children and young people, ranging in age from kindergarten to the college level, and ask them to describe three friends and one disliked peer. These interviews were conducted, and the items in the person descriptions were coded, using a content-analysis system (Peevers and Secord, 1972) on each of four dimensions of person concepts. These dimensions are (1) descriptiveness, which refers to the amount of information an item yields about a person; (2) depth of descriptiveness, which refers

to the degree to which personal characteristics are recognized as conditional upon certain situational or temporal states, or are explained in some way which offers new information about the person described; (3) personal involvement, which refers to the extent to which the describer involves himself in the description of another person; and (4) evaluative consistency, which refers to the extent to which undesirable qualities are recognized in friends, and desirable qualities in disliked persons.

The Children's Picture Test of Internal-External Control was selected for use as the measure of an individual's orientation to causality because it has been used by other researchers and seemed the most appropriate for use with all age groups. The Picture Test was administered to each of the 80 participants in the study.

However, certain conceptual problems arose in connection with scoring the Picture Test. In addition, when it was readministered to 18 participants one week to ten days after the first administration the test-retest reliability was found to be .50.

It was decided to concentrate all further efforts on developing a free-response instrument which would indicate an individual's characteristic pattern of attributing causality in interpersonal situations. In addition, no instrument was available which tapped the concept of intentionality. It was decided that the degree to which the agent contributed to the initiation of the act could also be determined by the same free response instrument. Such a device would provide a necessary tool for the exploration of possible linkages among the use of various person concepts, the attribution of causality, and the attribution of intentionality, as well as the development of these concepts.

Methods and Results

As a first step in the development of the proposed instrument, a review of the literature relevant to internal-external scales was conducted. Criticisms of existing scales suggested that the following points be considered in developing a locus of causality instrument:

(1) The attribution of causality differs for individual successes and failures (Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall, 1965; Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie, 1969).

(2) The attribution of causality may differ for an individual's orientation to the results of his own efforts, and to the way in which society operates in general (Gurin et al., 1969; Thomas, 1970).

(3) The attribution of causality to external forces may reflect reality factors operating in failure situations, as in the cases of minority groups and of individuals who are weaker physically or intellectually than those around them (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967; Gurin et al., 1969; Lao, 1970).

(4) The attribution of causality to external forces may consist of attribution to other people, or to luck, and it may be desirable to make a distinction between the two loci. In addition, external forces can be viewed as either benevolent or malevolent (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967).

(5) The attribution of causality may differ, depending upon the particular sphere of life (e.g., economic, political, academic, social) to which it pertains. Lao (1970) found that internality in the personal sense, as measured by items phrased in the first person on the Internal-External Control Scale (I-E Scale), was associated with academic competence. On the other hand, externality in the ideological sense, as measured by items phrased in the third person, related to social activism. This finding indicates that the internal-external variable has different meanings for different areas of an individual's life.

These points were considered in developing the Personal Causality Questionnaire (PCQ), which consists of 35 questions regarding everyday two-person situations to which an individual responds in his own words (Appendix A). A content analysis system was developed so that responses can be coded on the two dimensions of locus of causality and degree of agent-initiation. Items pertain to both pleasant and unpleasant interactions. In addition, some of the items represent the participant as the initiator of the action, and some items represent the other person as the initiator. An example of a pleasant, participant-initiated item is, "Why are you smiling at him?" An unpleasant, other-initiated item is, "Why is he frowning at you?" Male participants respond to questions referring to the other person as male; female participants, to the other person as female. The complete content analysis system for coding responses is presented in Appendix B. A general description of the coding on the two dimensions follows.

Locus of causality can be coded personal, mutual, or external. For a response to be scored as personal locus it must indicate that the respondent himself is the cause of the interpersonal action. Mutual locus responses are those in which the respondent indicates himself as the cause of the action, but shares the causality with the other person or an external force. External locus responses are those in which the respondent indicates the other person or an external force as the cause of the event. Examples of coding of locus of causality for responses to the question, "Why is he smiling at you?" follow:

(1) Because I did something nice for him. (Personal)

(2) Because we are friends. (Mutual)

(3) Because he likes me. (External)

Individuals are categorized as personal or external on locus of causality, depending upon which type of response they give more frequently.

Degree of agent-initiation can be coded intentional, incidental, or accidental, consistent with Heider's (1958) terminology. Responses which indicate that the action was intentionally initiated are scored 3, and represent the highest degree. Responses which attribute the action to personal characteristics or dispositions of the actor represent the intermediate degree of initiation. These responses are coded incidental and scored 2. Responses which attribute the action to luck, fate, accident, or a force external to the persons involved are coded accidental, scored 1, and represent the lowest degree of initiation. Personal initiation scores are computed for participants categorized as personal on locus of causality. This score is the mean of the initiation scores on items coded as personal locus. Similarly, external initiation scores are assigned to individuals categorized as external on locus by computing the mean initiation score on items coded external locus.

Examples of scoring of personal initiation for the question, "Why is he smiling at you?" follow:

(1) I did a big favor for him. (Intentional--3)

(2) I'm a nice guy. (Incidental--2)

(3) My socks don't match and I just found out. (Accidental--1)

Examples of scoring of external initiation for responses to the same question are as follows:

(1) He is trying to be friendly. (Intentional--3)

(2) He's just a happy guy. (Incidental--2)

(3) He couldn't help it. (Accidental--1)

It should be noted that not all 35 items are scored for each of the three dimensions. Only those items which were found to discriminate satisfactorily between high and low scorers on a particular dimension are used in scoring that dimension. The scoring key is shown in Appendix C.

The procedure for developing the PCQ was as follows. A pool of 113 questions regarding everyday two-person situations, one-half of which depicted actions respondent-initiated and one-half other-initiated, was compiled. Within these groups, one-half of the items depicted pleasant interactions, and one-half, unpleasant interactions. These items were divided into two forms of 56 and 57 items respectively. Form I was administered to 48 males and 46 females, and Form II was administered to 46 males and 48 females.

Each item was scored on the dimensions of locus of causality, personal initiation and external initiation. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed to determine the relationship for

each item between individuals' scores on the item and their total score on the dimension. Items with low correlation coefficients were deleted from the analysis, and the process repeated. Thirty-eight items were selected which had correlation coefficients of .22 or more on at least one of the dimensions measured.

The 38-item form was administered to 20 females and 33 males, and another item analysis performed. In addition, the 10% of the participants scoring the highest, the 10% scoring the lowest, and 10% representing the middle range for each dimension were identified, and their responses to items scored for that dimension were plotted graphically. Selection for inclusion in the final form of the PCQ required that scores on an item correlated positively with the total score on the dimension, and that a linear relationship existed among the responses of high, medium and low scorers on that dimension. Thirty-five items met these criteria.

This final form was administered to 20 participants, and another item analysis performed. On the basis of this analysis a few additional items were deleted from scoring, but are retained in the questionnaire.

To date, the 35-item form has been administered to 121 participants, and correlation coefficients with the total score on the relevant dimension again computed. These coefficients are shown in Appendix C.

As a test of inter-judge agreement on coding responses to the PCQ, 20 completed questionnaires were selected at random from the large number on file. These were coded independently by two coders. The percentage of agreement for coding locus of causality was .96, for personal initiation, .91, and for external initiation, .91.

To determine test-retest reliability, the PCQ was administered to 10 male and 10 female participants, and then re-administered to the same participants two weeks later. Since locus designations are categorical, the percentage of test-retest agreement was computed. Reliability coefficients for initiation indices are Pearson product moment correlations. Test-retest reliability coefficients were .85 for locus, .79 for personal initiation, and .82 for external initiation.

Because there is evidence indicating that individuals attribute responsibility for successes and failures in different ways, items pertaining to both pleasant and unpleasant interpersonal situations were included in the PCQ. All forms of the PCQ administered to date have included instructions requesting respondents to indicate for each item whether they believe it to depict a situation pleasant for both persons involved, or unpleasant for either of the persons. Statistical analysis of items indicated as pleasant and unpleasant by individualrespondents revealed no significant differences in terms of their attribution of locus of causality. That is, for the everyday situations described in the PCQ, participants assigned causality for unpleasant situations

to themselves as frequently as they did to others, and causality for pleasant situations as frequently to others as to themselves. In addition, there is no statistically significant difference in attribution of locus of causality between respondent- and other-initiated items (i.e., items phrased in the first person and items phrased in the third person). These findings indicate that the variables of pleasant vs. unpleasant and respondent- vs. other-initiated situations do not present problems of internal consistency for the PCQ.

In summary, the PCQ has been demonstrated to be a reliable and stable method for assessing an individual's characteristic pattern of attributing causality and degree of initiation of action in everyday two-person interactions. It answers the criticisms of the existing scales in the following ways:

(1) The attribution of causality in the particular case of everyday interpersonal events does not differ for those which are deemed pleasant and those considered unpleasant.

(2) The PCQ, because it deals with the results of one of two person's efforts, is not contaminated by the attribution of causality for the way in which society operates.

(3) Since the other person in the interaction is defined as a peer, and the situations depicted so common, no problem of success or failure which might affect responses is raised.

(4) The coding of the PCQ makes possible a distinction between attribution to other people and to luck; the former is coded as intentional or incidental degree of initiation, and the latter is coded accidental.

(5) The PCQ is oriented to a very specific sphere of an individual's life, that of everyday interpersonal situations. In addition, the phrasing of items in the first and the third person has been demonstrated to make no difference to the attribution of causality on the PCQ.

Finally, an open-ended instrument has several inherent advantages over the more common, forced-choice type. First, the range of possible responses is not limited. Second, this type of instrument insures more respondent-involvement than forced-choice types since he is required to make an original response. Further, because of the open-ended nature of the questionnaire, participants are not as likely to choose socially desirable responses as in the case of forced-choice instruments.

Conclusions

The PCQ is a tool which can be used to investigate the relationships among attribution of causality and intentionality, and various modes of describing persons. Preliminary work has demonstrated a

relationship, for those participants categorized as external on locus of causality, between the perceived degree of initiation of action and insightfulness in person descriptions. The latter was measured by counting the number of sub-categories of descriptiveness, as defined by the person concept code, used in a written description of a friend; the more sub-categories which were used, the more insightful the description was considered. Male subjects categorized as external on locus who perceived initiation as strong (i.e., intentional) used fewer sub-categories of descriptiveness than external males who perceived initiation as weak (i.e., accidental). External females, however, demonstrated an opposite effect. Those who perceived external initiation as being strong used more sub-categories in describing a friend than did those who perceived external initiation as being weak. These results will be interpreted, and other relationships between scores on the PCQ and the use of dimensions of person concepts will be explored.

Personal causality and self initiation, as assessed by the PCQ, have a number of important applications to education. Previous research on the relation of educational achievement to personal causality has yielded results that are difficult to interpret. For example, while the Coleman report indicated that the degree of personal causality was more strongly associated with educational advancement than any other variable, the meaning of this finding is not clear. One reason is that it could simply reflect a realistic appraisal of one's competence. Thus, the performance could be the cause of a low level of personal causality. In the case of minority groups, which are low on personal causality, it could reflect an accurate appraisal of their inferior life chances. Other measures of personal causality have a similar disadvantage. The present instrument, focusing on everyday two-person events, essentially eliminates the possibility that responses reflect one's place or one's opportunities in life. Thus it paves the way for looking at the more specific variables of personal causality and self initiation in relation to educational achievement.

In addition, one innovative direction that education is taking involves various means of giving more autonomy to the pupil or student--allowing him to work on his own to a greater extent. The personal causality measure could be used to determine which children are ready for this kind of instruction, and also could constitute a measure of whether such instruction increases the degree of self-initiating orientation. It is possible also that patterns of perception of an individual's own causality and degree of initiation are basic components of his creativity and propensity to innovate. The PCQ could be used to explore this possibility.

Finally, the content-analysis system for coding free responses on the dimensions of attribution of causality and intentionality has been developed, and can be applied to other free-response instruments devised to measure these concepts in different spheres of an individual's life, as well as in other types of interpersonal situations. For example, the present instrument deals with everyday two-person situations;

another instrument could be devised regarding very salient two-person situations, and the same coding system could be used. In addition, the PCQ, with only slightly revised instructions, could be used to investigate such questions as the attribution of causality and intentionality to persons of the opposite sex, to persons of higher and lower status, and to adults, such as parents and teachers, by children.

References

Battle, E. S. and Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.

Bialer, I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 303-320.

Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W. and Crandall, V. J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.

Crandall, V. J., Katkovsky, W., and Preston, A. Motivational and ability determinants of young children's intellectual achievement behaviors. Child Development, 1962, 33, 643-661.

DeCharms, Richard. Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R. C. and Beattie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of negro youths. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25 (3), 29-53.

Heider, F. Social perception and phenomenal causality. Psychological Review, 1944, 51 (6), 358-374.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Hersch, P. D. and Scheibe, K. E. Reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31 (6), 609-613.

Jones, E. E. and Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965, 219-266.

Kelley, H. H. Attribution theory in social psychology. Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1967, 192-236.

Lao, R. C. Internal-external control and competent and innovative behavior among negro college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14 (3), 263-270.

Nowicki, S., Jr. and Strickland, B. R. A locus of control scale for children. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1970.

Peevers, B. H. and Secord, P. F. The development of person concepts in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, No. 1 (Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J. B., Seeman, M. and Liverant, S. Internal vs. external control of reinforcements: A major variable in behavior theory. In N. F. Washburne (Ed.), Decisions, values and groups. New York: Pergamon Press, 1962, 473-516.

Thomas, L. E. The I-E scale, ideological bias, and political participation. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38 (2), 273-286.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Each of the items in this questionnaire describes an action that you or another person might perform. Write a one-sentence answer to each question. When answering the questions, please think of the other person as someone the same age as yourself. Treat each item as an episode independent of the other episodes. You may wish to imagine different persons for different items.

Don't think too much about a question--just put down what comes to your mind first.

When you have written your one-sentence answer to a question, place a check on the appropriate line at the right to indicate whether you consider the interaction to have been pleasant or unpleasant in terms of interpersonal relations. In other words, if you think you and the other person involved were both happy about the interaction, you would check "pleasant." If you think either you or the other person were unhappy about the interaction you would check "unpleasant."

	Pleasant	Unpleasant
1. Why are you telling him that funny story?		
_____	___	___
2. Why is he giving you the money?		
_____	___	___
3. Why did you turn your back on him?		
_____	___	___
4. Why are you going to his party?		
_____	___	___
5. Why is he accepting your money?		
_____	___	___
6. Why is he frowning at you?		
_____	___	___
7. Why don't you talk much when you're with him?		
_____	___	___
8. Why are you happy for him?		
_____	___	___
9. Why didn't he hear what you said?		
_____	___	___

	Pleasant	Unpleasant
10. Why is he smiling at you?		
_____	___	___
11. Why are you lending him the book?		
_____	___	___
12. Why is he keeping your pencil?		
_____	___	___
13. Why won't you tell him what happened?		
_____	___	___
14. Why are you helping him?		
_____	___	___
15. Why does he agree with you?		
_____	___	___
16. Why won't he explain his idea to you?		
_____	___	___
17. Why are you laughing at what he said?		
_____	___	___
18. Why is he picking up your pencil for you?		
_____	___	___

	Pleasant	Unpleasant
19. Why won't you explain your idea to him?		
_____	___	___
20. Why is he laughing at you?		
_____	___	___
21. Why won't he help you?		
_____	___	___
22. Why are you smiling at him?		
_____	___	___
23. Why did you forget what he told you?		
_____	___	___
24. Why is he giving you a present?		
_____	___	___
25. Why are you accepting his money?		
_____	___	___
26. Why are you arguing with him?		
_____	___	___
27. Why are you listening to what he is saying?		
_____	___	___

	Pleasant	Unpleasant
28. Why isn't he coming to your party?		
_____	___	___
29. Why do you talk so much when you're with him?		
_____	___	___
30. Why aren't you speaking to him?		
_____	___	___
31. Why is he happy for you?		
_____	___	___
32. Why aren't you congratulating him?		
_____	___	___
33. Why did you tell him the latest news?		
_____	___	___
34. Why are you frowning at him?		
_____	___	___
35. Why are you giving him the money?		
_____	___	___

Appendix B

Coding Directions

Responses to the Personal Causality Questionnaire (PCQ) are scored on each of the two dimensions of locus of causality and degree of agent-initiation of action. Each response is categorized as personal (P), mutual (M), or external (X), depending upon where the cause of the action or situation is stated to reside. In addition, each response coded P or X is assigned a number to indicate the degree of agent initiation of the action or situation which is implied. Detailed instructions for scoring each of the dimensions follow.

Locus of causality refers to whether the respondent accepts personal responsibility for causing an action or outcome, or whether he attributes the responsibility for causation to someone or something other than himself. Responses which indicate personal causality are scored P (personal), and those which refer to external causality are scored X (external). Responses which refer to both personal and external loci of causality are scored M (mutual). Responses are scored U (unclassifiable) in the following cases: (1) the response clearly indicates that the question has been misread or misunderstood; (2) the subject of the response sentence is ambiguous; (3) the question is not answered; (4) the response is "I don't know"; (5) the response denies the question (example: "Why are you arguing with him?" "I never argue with him.").

The subject of the sentence defines the locus of causality. That is, personal responses are those in which the pronoun "I" is the subject of the sentence, and external responses are those in which "he," "she," "it," or a noun is the subject of a sentence. Responses in which a noun preceded by "my" is the subject of the sentence, however, are coded personal (example: "My manners bother him.").

There is one exception to this rule. When an individual describes a characteristic of another person or states a prediction about a reaction of another as fact it is considered personal to the individual to whom it is attributed and external to the person who attributes (example: "I know he is honest."--external). An opinion about another's characteristics or reactions, however, is considered personal to the individual expressing the opinion and external to the person about whom the opinion is expressed, consistent with the general rule for scoring (example: "I think he is honest."--personal). The following examples illustrate this distinction:

Personal Responses	External Responses
I think he is friendly.	I know he is friendly.
He knows I am friendly.	He thinks I am friendly.
I don't think he will return my book.	I know he won't return it.
He knows I will return it.	He thinks I will return it.

I think he is wrong. He knows I am right.	I know he is wrong. He thinks I am right.

Mutual responses are those which employ "we" or "he (or she) and I" as the subject of the sentence. In addition, responses which have two parts, one of which is personal and one of which is external are coded mutual (examples: "We are friends." "He and I always share things." "I am interested and he knows what he is talking about.").

Responses using both "he (or she)" and "I" can take three forms, as follows:

	Example	Scored
Case 1: "he (or she) and I" as the subject of the sentence.	He and I think alike.	Mutual
Case 2: "he (or she)" as the subject of one clause and "I" as the subject of another clause.	He said something and I didn't like it.	Mutual
Case 3: "he (or she)" or "I" used in a phrase preceded by a real or implied "that."	I said something he thought was funny.	Personal
	He did something I didn't like.	External

Note that scoring of these responses is consistent with the general grammatical rule of coding on the basis of the subject of the sentence.

In some responses the subject of the sentence is implied rather than stated. In this case the implied subject is scored as the locus of causality. An example of a response of this kind to the question, "Why is he frowning at you?" is "Doesn't like me." In this example, "he" as the subject of the sentence is implied, and the response scored external. If the subject of the sentence is ambiguous, the response is scored U.

Responses stated in infinitive form express intention and are scored according to whether the respondent or the other person is expressing the intention. Examples are:

Question	Response	Scored
Why is he giving you the money?	To buy something for him.	External
Why don't you talk much when you're with him?	To annoy him.	Personal

An individual is categorized as personal or external depending upon which type of response he gives most frequently to the following items: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 14, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35.

Degree of agent-initiation refers to the extent to which the individual defined as the locus of causality is perceived to act intentionally and purposefully. Responses coded M and U are not scored for agent-initiation. Three categories of degree of control are distinguished: weak initiation (scored 1), moderate initiation (scored 2), and strong initiation (scored 3). Degree of initiation, therefore, is nested within locus of causality; i.e., responses which are not coded U or M can be one of the following: P1, P2, P3, X1, X2, or X3. The classification scheme which provides the criteria for scoring responses for degree of initiation follows.

1. Weak initiation. Responses indicating little or no initiation of actions are those which refer to the following:
   A. Circumstance or luck.
      It fell on the floor. X1
      I won a car. P1
   B. Ownership.
      The book is mine. X1
      I own it. P1
   C. Initiation of an unsuccessful action.
      I didn't graduate. P1
      I was wrong. P1
      I didn't say it loud enough. P1
   D. Needs, implication of external force.
      I need a friend. P1
      He does not need any help. X1
      I had to tell someone. P1
      He could hardly wait to say it. X1
   E. Behavior governed by norms.
      I owe it to him. P1
      He's repaying a debt. X1
      It's polite. X1
   F. Role categories.
      He's a friend. X1
      I am his brother. P1
   G. Status passage when no achievement is implied.
      He got drafted. X1
      She is pregnant. X1
      I switched jobs. P1
   H. Qualities inherent in something other than a person.
      It was a funny joke. X1
      It was a rotten idea. X1
   I. Lack of ability.
      I did something stupid. P1
      I can't do it. P1
      He doesn't understand the subject. X1
   J. Physical appearance over which the individual has no control.
      He is too tall. X1
      He is good looking. X1
      She's ugly. X1

2. Moderate initiation. Responses indicating some degree of initiation of actions or outcomes are those which refer to the following:
   A. Favorable and unfavorable dispositions and implied dispositions.
      He's friendly. X2
      She is nice. X2
      I am stupid. P2
   B. Emotions and feelings.
      I love her. P2
      She likes me. X2
      He hates her. X2
      I care about the people. P2
      I feel bad. P2
      I am afraid of her. P2
   C. Thinking and believing; being sure and unsure; understanding and not understanding.
      I think she is smart. P2
      She believes me. X2
      I'm not sure. P2
      He understands. X2
   D. Interests.
      That interests me. X2
      I am interested in psychology. P2
   E. Moderate statements of ability (as opposed to strong statements of ability).
      I can do it. P2
      I'm better at it than she is. P2
   F. Physical appearance over which the individual has control.
      She keeps up a good appearance. X2
      He dresses well. X2
   G. Status passage which implies achievement.
      I got promoted. P2
      He graduated. X2
3. Strong initiation. Responses in this category are those which clearly imply that an individual is acting intentionally and purposefully. Responses indicating strong initiation of actions are those which refer to the following:
   A. The initiation of a successful action which implies intentionality; a statement of earning or deserving.
      I smiled at him. P3
      I told a joke. P3
      I disagreed. P3
      He earned it. X3
      He deserves it. X3
   B. Expression of a desire; gratification of a desire.
      I wanted it. P3
      She wants to go to graduate school. X3
      I got the job I wanted. P3
   C. A lie, offense, insult, hurt, etc.
      I told him off. P3
      He insulted me. X3

I rejected him. P3
He let me down. X3

D. Strong statement of ability.
I have a photographic memory. P3
I am an expert. P3

Note that dispositional words are sometimes used to describe a purpose for a specific action rather than in the more general sense of describing what a person is like. When used in the latter sense, such references are scored 2, but when used to describe a purpose, such references are scored 3. Examples to clarify this distinction are:

I am doing it to be mean. P3
I am mean. P2
I am being friendly. P3
I am friendly. P2

When a response has two or more scorable parts, all of which are personal or all of which are external, score the greatest degree of initiation. That is, two parts which would be scored separately as P1 and P2 would be scored P2. For example, "I want (P3) and need (P1) his help." is scored P3.

A general rule for scoring degree of initiation is to score a response 3 only if there is no reasonable doubt that it belongs in that category. If doubt exists about the degree of control, the response should be scored 1 or 2.

For individuals categorized as personal on locus of causality, a degree of personal initiation score is calculated by computing the mean of the initiation scores on the following items to which the individual has made a personal response: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 35. That is, the initiation scores for those items coded personal are added, and divided by the number of items coded personal.

For individuals categorized external on locus, a degree of external control score is similarly obtained by computing the mean of the control scores on the following items to which the individual has made an external response: 2, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, 19 and 28.

Examples of Scoring Specific Items

Item #1: Why are you telling him that funny story?
P1: I couldn't keep it to myself; I had to tell someone; I had nothing else to do.
P2: I thought he'd like it; I thought it was funny; I always tell jokes.
P3: To make him laugh; I wanted to see how he would react.
X1: It was hilarious; he needs a good laugh; he told me one.
X2: He likes jokes; he was feeling down.
X3: He asked me to cheer him up; he wanted to hear it.
M: We always exchange jokes; he told me one so I told him one.

Item #2: Why is he giving you the money?

P1: I loaned it to him; I need it; I would do the same for him; he knows it is mine.

P2: I am always broke; I feel like going out tonight.

P3: I asked him for it; I want to buy something.

X1: He owes it to me; he's paying me back.

X2: He's honest; he thinks I need it.

X3: To buy something for him; he wants to help me.

M: We are friends; he lends me money and I lend him money.

Item #7: Why don't you talk much when you're with him?

P1: I have nothing to say; I can't talk when I'm with him; I don't need to.

P2: I feel insecure; I don't like to talk; I'm quiet.

P3: I don't want to; I want to listen to him.

X1: He needs to talk; he's deaf.

X2: He makes me uncomfortable; he isn't interested; he talks all the time.

X3: He wants to talk.

M: We understand each other; he talks and I listen.

Item #19: Why won't you explain your idea to him?

P1: I can't explain it; I don't have it figured out yet.

P2: I don't like to explain things until they're worked out; I am not sure it's really a good idea.

P3: To be mean; I don't want to.

X1: It's none of his business; he wouldn't understand it; he's too busy.

X2: He isn't interested; he's not smart enough to understand it.

X3: He doesn't want to hear it; he didn't ask me.

M: We don't discuss those things; he wouldn't understand and I don't want to talk about it.

Appendix C

Calculation of Scores and Item Correlations

Scored for Locus		Scored for Personal Initiation		Scored for External Initiation	
Item #	Correlation with total score*	Item #	Correlation with total score**	Item #	Correlation with total score**
1	.79	1	.45	2	.52
2	.19	2	.31	7	.51
3	.33	3	.38	8	.24
4	.32	5	.24	11	.36
7	.53	6	.46	13	.38
9	.37	11	.43	18	.49
14	.30	12	.37	19	.55
19	.32	14	.28	28	.32
21	.08	19	.13		
22	.74	20	.44		
23	.35	23	.44		
25	.26	25	.32		
26	.64	26	.37		
27	.57	29	.20		
29	.78	30	.48		
30	.52	32	.54		
33	.51	33	.08		
34	.62	35	.24		
35	.52				

*Gamma
**Pearson Product Moment Correlations

Calculation of Scores

Locus: A participant is categorized as personal or external depending upon which response he gives most frequently to the 19 items scored for locus. In the case of equal personal and external responses, the participant is categorized personal.

Personal Initiation: This score is calculated only for those participants categorized personal on locus. Determine which of the 18 items scored for personal initiation are coded personal, and compute the mean degree of initiation score for those items.

External Initiation: This score is calculated only for those participants categorized external on locus. Determine which of the 8 items scored for external initiation are coded external, and compute the mean degree of initiation for those items.